Atty Docket: PUMA 1000-1

Application No. 09/256,845

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7-9, 13, 15-18, 21, 26-29, 35, 39 and 44 previously were cancelled. Claims 2-6, 10-12, 14, 19, 20, 22-25, 30-34, 36-38, 40-43 and 45-60 are now pending and are currently rejected to in this application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections without amendment, because the "dictionary" as used in these claims cannot be interpreted as a list of words, items or terms to be referenced.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

Based on Applicants' prior traverse of the combination of Krishna and Kiyono, the Examiner withdrew the prior rejections without responding to the traverse (section 9, page 15). The Examiner introduced an additional reference, Foley et al. (USP 5,706,502), to which Applicants fully responded.

The Examiner again concedes that the term "dictionary" does not appear in Foley. Several pages of analysis by Applicants were meet by a succinct argument that "the term 'dictionary' can be interpreted as a list of words, items, or terms to be referenced. Therefore, the Examiner applied Foley to teach such listing of applets ...", to which we now respond.

In ordinary conversation, a dictionary does not mean "a list of words, items, or terms to be referenced." A dictionary requires more, such as dictionary definitions of words. If the Examiner went to the book store, bought a heafty dictionary, took it home and found only the words, not the definitions listed, we can fairly guess that the Examiner would cry "foul."

Independent claim 60, for instance, includes the following limitations:

a dictionary that associates the abstract references with one or more run-time services; and

a template manager, responsive to the client request that identifies the particular template, including logic that

accesses the template repository and parses the particular template,

accesses the dictionary and resolves the abstract references to the associated run-time services, and

Page 9 of 10

Atty Docket: PUMA 1000-1

Application No. 09/256,845

In these claim limitations, a dictionary does more than list applets. A dictionary at least associates abstract references in templates with one or more run-time services. The template manager, response to the client request, accesses the dictionary and uses it to resolve references to the associated run-time services. Applicants do not find these limitations taught or suggested in Foley (col. 5, lines 23-27 and lines 58-63 or Figure 1 item 140A.) Resolving abstract references through an abstraction layer to run-time services overcomes the problem of JAVA applets, that they are invoked directly by name.

Virtually the same limitations appear in independent claim 46 as in claim 60.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, with this further discussion of Foley, are in condition for allowance and solicit acceptance of the claims, in light of these remarks. If the Examiner disagrees and sees amendments that might facilitate allowance of the claims, a call would be appreciated.

Should any questions arise, the undersigned can ordinarily be reached at his office at 650-712-0340 from 8:30 to 5:30 PST, Monday through Friday, and can be reached at his cell phone 415-902-6112 most other times.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 21 March 2005

Emest J. Beffel, Jr., Reg. No. 43,489

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP P.O. Box 366 Half Moon Bay, CA 94019 (650) 712-0340 phone (650) 712-0263 fax